

Waters Wittman Yoder
Weber (TX) Woodall Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—31

Brady (TX)	Grijalva	Quigley
Calvert	Hanna	Rohrabacher
Castor (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Coble	Holding	Simpson
Courtney	Labrador	Sires
Crawford	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Van Hollen
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Visclosky
Duffy	Moran	Webster (FL)
Garcia	Nadler	
Gohmert	Nolan	

□ 1111

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 458 and 459.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 458, on passage of H.R. 2775, to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, I would have voted "No."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 459, on approving the Journal, I would have voted "no."

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR
OF H.R. 1001

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1001, a bill originally introduced by Representative Bonner of Alabama, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprinting pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 2 p.m., and no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and

Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Madam Speaker, Members are advised that, pending ongoing discussions on the continuing resolution, the House may need to be in session during the week of September 23 and possibly into the weekend. Members should expect an announcement next week regarding when the House would meet during the week of September 23. This is a change from the previously announced schedule.

Madam Speaker, next week, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will likely consider H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, sponsored by the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Representative DOC HASTINGS. In addition to improving forest health and helping to prevent catastrophic wildfires, this legislation contains a short-term extension of the Secure Rural Schools program.

In addition, I expect the House to consider H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013, authored by Representative MARK AMODEI; and H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013, drafted by Representative PAUL GOSAR. These bills, both from the Natural Resources Committee, will foster economic growth and create jobs for the middle class.

The House will also consider the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act, authored by Agriculture chairman, Representative FRANK LUCAS. This legislation restores the intent of the bipartisan welfare reforms adopted in 1996 to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It also refocuses the program on those who need it most. No law-abiding beneficiary who meets the income and asset tests of the current program and is willing to comply with the applicable work requirements will lose his benefits under the bill.

Finally, Madam Speaker, Members should be prepared to vote on the continuing resolution as the new fiscal year approaches.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I would reiterate to Members, in case they weren't listening, that the majority leader has said that we ought to be clearing our calendars for the week of the 23rd of September. That's the last week of the month. Originally, we were scheduled to be off that week, but in light of the fact that we have been unable yet to pass a continuing resolution or appropriations bills to fund the government's activities after the end of the fiscal year on September 30, I am pleased to see the majority leader is putting the House on notice. I have

been telling my Members for the last 2 months to reserve that time in the contingency of which the majority leader speaks.

Mr. Majority Leader, before we left in July, we had a bill on the floor to fund Transportation and the Housing and Urban Development Department as well as other items. That bill was pulled. Subsequent to that bill's being pulled, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, sent a notice out to a lot of people. I presume the gentleman had an opportunity to read it.

It read:

I am extremely disappointed with the decision to pull the T-HUD bill—as it's referred to—from the House calendar today. The prospects for passing this bill in September are bleak at best given the vote count on passage that was apparent this afternoon.

He then made this statement, Mr. Leader:

With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted 3 months ago. Thus, I—HAL ROGERS speaking—believe that the House has made its choice. Sequestration and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts must be brought to an end.

Mr. Leader, as you know, he went on to say this:

The House, Senate and White House must come together as soon as possible on a comprehensive compromise that repeals sequestration, takes the Nation off this lurching path from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis, reduces our deficits and debt, and provides a realistic, top-line, discretionary spending level to fund the government in a responsible and attainable way.

That was his statement—the chairman from Kentucky, a conservative Republican—on July 31, 2013.

I want to tell my friend, the majority leader, that I agree with Mr. ROGERS. The sequester level is unattainable and unrealistic. That's the chairman of your Appropriations Committee, who is responsible—and has been for many years—for judging what are the appropriate expenditures for our government to maintain programs important to our country, to our economy, and to our national security.

Mr. Leader, we have another issue beyond the continuing resolution which will also, as the gentleman knows, have a very substantial effect on the fiscal credibility of America, on the fiscal stability of America and on the growth of our economy, and of the confidence of our people and of people around the world, and that is the extension of our debt limit. This is going to be a shorter colloquy than we usually have because the issues that confront us are so very, very important.

I want to tell the majority leader that we have not had any discussions about a possible compromise; nor have we had any discussions with Mr. MCCARTHY about a possible compromise; nor have I or the leader had any substantive conversations with the Speaker about a substantive compromise, in our view, consistent with what your chairman of the Appropriations Committee rightfully, in my

view, observed of the fiscal realities confronting our country. You have said and Mr. BOEHNER has said—I believe and Ms. PELOSI believes—that not extending the debt limit is unthinkable; and if we fail to do so, it would have very, very serious, adverse consequences on our country.

So rather than discuss other further scheduling issues, except to the extent that the gentleman wants to respond, let me say to the gentleman that, with these two items in particular, I stand ready to work with your side, and my side stands ready to work with your side on a compromise; but I will tell the gentleman, with all sincerity, that we will not pursue what Mr. ROGERS correctly observed is an unsustainable and damaging process. To that extent, we will not compromise on that issue because your chairman is correct—it's harmful to our country.

So, in that context, Mr. Leader, I am hopeful that, as we move forward, as you've just been required to have another week added to the calendar because we've been unable so far to do our work—and this week, of course, is 1 of 2 weeks that we were supposed to meet in September, and we haven't done much. That's unfortunate. So we have used 50 percent of the time that we had for not much. I would ask the gentleman if he thinks that there is a possibility to compromise. I have observed and the world has observed the difficulty the gentleman and Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker, have had in getting agreement in your own party, but we need to get agreement between the two parties and the Senate and the President of the United States so that this country can be funded and can meet its obligations and stabilize our economy. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

First, I would say I'm glad he received the news that we may very well be in session in the last week of September the way he has because I do think it reflects the seriousness with which both sides take the pending fiscal issues and deadlines that we are about to confront both in the continuing resolution as well as in the debt ceiling, itself.

Now, Madam Speaker, I've set aside the statement that my friend, the Democratic whip, has indicated about not doing anything this week, because we just voted on a bipartisan bill enforcing accountability on ObamaCare.

As the Democratic whip knows, ObamaCare is growingly unpopular in this country. In fact, in the latest public poll out today, nearly 60 percent of Americans reject ObamaCare and the direction in health care, and we are serious and committed on this side of the aisle for a better future for health care. The President, himself, has said that it's not ready for prime time and has issued waivers for businesses, for insurance companies. We need to have a waiver and a delay for all people of ObamaCare.

The bill that we passed today says that the administration is hoping that all of the income subsidies that are still in effect will go forward in a transparent and accountable way. That's really impossible to guard against fraud given that the administration has already exempted corporate America and the businesses from having to comply with the verification of someone's eligibility for subsidies. So there is no way that this law can work; and our side is committed to discussing how we go forward, which is, first and foremost, a delay of ObamaCare.

I'd say to the gentleman that I'm glad that he is willing to sit down and talk, and I would hope that he could impose that upon the administration, because as late as August 27, 2013, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew said:

The President has made it clear: we are not going to negotiate over the debt limit.

I would say, Madam Speaker, history has shown us that in periods of divided government there have always been discussions around the fiscal issues of this country; and in fact, the issue of the debt ceiling has provided a forum for resolution on some of those fiscal issues. Going back to Gramm-Rudman-Hollings that was negotiated and settled around a debt ceiling discussion, as was the Congressional Review Act, as was, Madam Speaker, as we know 2 years ago, the Budget Control Act. So I hope that the gentleman could take his dedication to trying to work things out to the White House and say it's time for all of us to sit down and resolve these issues.

Now, as far as the sequester is concerned, I would say to the gentleman he knows I don't think that the sequester is the right way and the best way to go about reducing spending. I mean, just by its very nature, a blunt, across-the-board cut treats programs that you might want to get rid of in the same way that it treats programs that, perhaps, are really doing a great job. That indiscriminate type of cut is something on which we could really do better. We could do a lot better than doing those kinds of cuts, which is exactly our point. We need to sit down and discuss with this administration how we are going to effect the reforms that we need on the entitlement side and effect the delay of ObamaCare. That's what we've got to do, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. The problem has again been expressed. We have a single focus of the majority party, Madam Speaker, on defunding the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1130

So many Republicans have said it is an unreasonable and irrational expectation to expect, after an election has occurred in which that was one of the principal issues in the election, for the President or, frankly, the Senate, to agree to the objectives of the Republican Party that lost in America on this issue. There was a poll taken November 2012. The President of the United States won that poll. Your my-

opic focus on that one issue threatens to shut down government and put at risk the creditworthiness of the United States of America. That is not what the American people expect.

Unless the gentleman wants to respond, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

IN RECOGNITION OF LANGHAM LOGISTICS

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly exceptional Hoosier company and a great friend in Langham Logistics and its president, Cathy Langham.

Today, Langham Logistics will be celebrating their 25th anniversary. Langham Logistics was founded by two sisters, Cathy and Margaret Langham, who took the risk of starting a transportation business. Cathy and Margaret literally built Langham from the ground up, starting in a small office space and now operating a 300,000-square-foot state-of-the-art warehouse that operates and advises supply chains from the smallest of companies to multibillion-dollar corporations throughout the world. Their story is not unlike so many people in this country who dared to dream and then succeeded beyond even their own wildest dreams.

Their customers aren't the only ones who have noticed their hard work. In 2003, then-President George W. Bush visited Langham Logistics to highlight them as a model start-up business that succeeded and was continuing to expand at an amazing rate. It was at that event that I first met Cathy Langham.

Not only has Cathy and her family built this amazing operation, but they did it the right way—through hard work. They gave back and continue to give back every chance they can. I could list all the numerous charities and causes that Cathy, her team, and her family contribute to, but that will go well beyond the 1 minute, Madam Speaker, that I asked for.

On behalf of Hoosiers, I say congratulations to Cathy and Langham Logistics. May you have another 25 years like the last 25.